



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

21
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,369	01/09/2002	Tadashi Noguchi	05905.0156	2856
7590	05/06/2004		EXAMINER	
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. 1300 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3315			BETIT, JACOB F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2175	8
DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

X

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/040,369	NOGUCHI, TADASHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jacob F. Betit	2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6 and 7.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is longer than 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b) and see below.

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The arrangement of the disclosed application does not conform with 37 CFR 1.77(b).

Some section headings do not appear in upper case lettering. Section headings should appear in upper case lettering. Appropriate corrections are required according to the guidelines provided below:

4. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without

underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 8, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 1 in line 8 recites the limitation "the second information" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of examining it is assumed that it was meant --the second data-- instead of "the second information".

8. Claims 8, 10, and 12 are rejected under U.S.C 112, second paragraph, because they are dependent from the rejected independent claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-7, 12-20, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Buchanan et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,267,155).

As to claim 1, Buchanan et al. teaches an information processing system (see column 2, lines 41-53) comprising:

module for scanning first data to be used by application software and extracting information for searching a database (see column 5, lines 13-26);

module for extracting second data from a database on the basis of the extracted information (see column 5, lines 39-65); and

module for inserting the second information into the location from which the information of the first data has been extracted (see column 6, lines 34-50).

As to claim 2, Buchanan et al. teaches an information processing system (see column 2, lines 41-53) comprising:

search information storage module for storing first information (hereinafter referred to as the "first search information") for searching a database in association with identification information (see column 5, lines 13-17);

identification information extracting module for extracting the identification information by scanning the first data to be used by application software (see column 5, lines 17-26);

search information extracting module for extracting the first search information corresponding to the extracted identification information by referring to the search information storage module (see column 5, lines 27-30);

data extracting module for extracting second data by searching a database on the basis of the extracted first search information (see column 5, lines 39-65); and

data inserting module for inserting the extracted second data into the location from which the identification information of the first data has been extracted (see column 6, lines 34-50).

As to claim 14, Buchanan et al. teaches an information processing method comprising (see column 2, lines 41-53) the steps of:

scanning first data to be used by application software and extracting information for searching a database (see column 5, lines 13-26);

extracting second data from a database on the basis of the extracted information (see column 5, lines 39-65); and

inserting the second data into the location from which the information of the first data has been extracted (see column 6, lines 34-50).

As to claim 15, Buchanan et al. teaches an information processing method (see column 2, lines 41-53) comprising:

an identification information extracting step of scanning first data to be used by application software, thereby extracting identification information (see column 5, lines 13-17);

a search information extracting step of referring to search information storage module for storing first information (hereinafter referred to as the "first search information") for searching a database in association with identification information, thereby extracting the first search information corresponding to the extracted identification information (see column 5, lines 17-30);

a data extracting step of searching a database on the basis of the extracted first search information, thereby extracting second data (see column 5, lines 39-65); and

a data insertion step of inserting the extracted second data into the location from which the identification information of the first data has been extracted (see column 6, lines 34-50).

As to claims 3 and 16, Buchanan et al. teaches wherein the first search information at least includes information for specifying a database and information for specifying a part or all of the search conditions (see column 6, lines 34-46).

As to claims 4 and 17, Buchanan et al. teaches wherein the identification information extracting module extracts, in addition to the identification information, second information (hereinafter referred to as the "second search information") for searching a database, the second search information being located in association with the identification information, and the data extracting module searches a database on the basis of the first search information and the second search information (see column 6, lines 23-33).

As to claims 5 and 18, Buchanan et al. teaches wherein the second search information at least includes information for specifying a part or all of the search conditions (see column 6, lines 23-33).

As to claims 6 and 19, Buchanan et al. teaches wherein the system can register or update the first search information with the search information storage module on the basis of user input (see column 4, line 33 through column 5, line 12).

As to claims 7 and 20, Buchanan et al. teaches wherein the search information storage module stores a plurality of the first search information by classifying it into a plurality of groups (see column 4, line 58 through column 5, line 12).

As to claims 12-13, and 25-26, Buchanan et al. teaches wherein at least any one of the inputs or outputs to the application software, database, or the user, is performed through a communication network (see column 10, lines 1-6).

As to claim 27, Buchanan et al. teaches a computer readable recording medium with a program stored therein for performing on a computer the information processing method according to claim 14 (the applicant is referred to the remarks and discussions made for claim 14 above, where it is inherent that the method and system described would most commonly be preformed using a program stored on one or more hard disks in one or more computers; and see figure 1).

As to claim 28, Buchanan et al. teaches a computer readable recording medium with a program stored therein for performing on a computer the information processing method according to claim 15 (the applicant is referred to the remarks and discussions made for claim 15 above, where it is inherent that the method and system described would most commonly be preformed using a program stored on one or more hard disks in one or more computers; and see figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 8-9 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,267,155) in view of Van Huben et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,327,594).

As to claims 8-9 and 21-22 Buchanan et al. does not teach wherein the application software is spreadsheet software and the first data is tabular data.

Van Huben et al. teaches a common access method that enables disparate pervasive computers to interact with centralized data management systems (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the application software is spreadsheet software and the first data is tabular data (see column 25, lines 49-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Buchanan et al. to include wherein the application software is spreadsheet software and the first data is tabular data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Buchanan et al. by the teachings of Van Huben et al. because wherein the application software is spreadsheet software and the first data is tabular data

would be a simple application that would provide tabular data format and perform sort and search operations on fields (see Van Huben et al., column 25, lines 58-63).

13. Claims 10-11 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,267,155) in view of Salas et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,233,600 B1).

As to claims 10-11 and 23-24 Buchanan et al. does not teach wherein the application software is browser software and the first data is document data described in a structured tag language such as html.

Salas et al. teaches wherein the application software is browser software and the first data is document data described in a structured tag language such as html (see column 6, lines 40-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Buchanan et al. to include wherein the application software is browser software and the first data is document data described in a structured tag language such as html.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Buchanan et al. by the teachings of Salas et al. because wherein the application software is browser software and the first data is document data described in a structured tag language such as html would allow users to share files over time zones and geographic boundaries (see Salas et al., abstract).

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. patent No. 6,578,035 B1 to Barker for teaching validation of a database and using pointers to reference valid object data of a database on another server within the system, when the affected replicas are removed from the server.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Betit whose telephone number is (703) 305-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/040,369
Art Unit: 2175

Page 12

23 April 2004



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER